



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,275	12/05/2003	Tim Hellman	SDV-001B	1607

21323 7590 06/13/2005

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

BLACKMAN, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2676

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/729,275

Applicant(s)

HELLMAN, TIM

Examiner

ANTHONY J. BLACKMAN

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2 and 4-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LINZER et al, US Patent Application Publication, Pub., No. US 2004/0100577.

3. As per claim 1, examiner interprets LINZER et al to meet the following limitations as claimed, A method for storing pixel image data (section 0042) in a machine-readable memory (the memory controller means is analogous to the machine-readable memory, see fig 4 and 5, element 101 and section 0023), the method

Comprising;

decomposing pixel image data into multiple colorspace components (section 0043); and storing the multiple colorspace components in one continuous machine-readable memory segment in a machine readable memory (see section 0042 - "Cb and co-located Cr pixels may be stored adjacent to each other"), the machine readable memory

Art Unit: 2676

having one or more burst boundaries (section 0042 also discloses more than one burst boundary) .

4. As per claim 2, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 1, including, wherein the machine-readable memory comprises volatile memory (SDRAM is analogous to volatile memory – see sections 0006, 0008 and 0033).

5. As per claim 4, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 2, including, wherein the volatile memory comprises static random memory (see sections 0006, 0008 and 0033)

6. As per claim 5, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 1, including, wherein the colorspace components comprise luminance, red difference sample, and blue difference sample see (section 0042)

7. As per claim 7, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 1, including, wherein the pixel image data comprises a first data byte (section 0007), the first data byte being registered at a memory address immediately following one of the one or more burst boundaries (see section 0007 and section 0054 matches the address means with the burst means for the at least one burst boundary).

8. As per claim 8, of claim 1 wherein the pixel image data comprises a first data byte and subsequent data bytes (see section 0007), one of the subsequent data bytes being registered at a memory address immediately following one of the one or more burst boundaries (see section 0007 and section 0054 matches the address means with the burst means for the at least one burst boundary).

9. As per claim 9, claim 9 is substantially similar to claim 1.

Art Unit: 2676

10. As per claim 10, claim 10 is substantially similar to claim 2.
11. As per claim 11, claim 11 is substantially similar to claim 3.
12. As per claim 12, claim 12 is substantially similar to claim 4.
13. As per claim 13, claim 13 is substantially similar to claim 5.
14. As per claim 15, Claim 15 is substantially similar to claim 7.
15. As per claim 16, claim 16 is substantially similar to claim 8.

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 3, 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LINZER et al, US Patent Application Publication, Pub. No. US 2004/0100577 in view of BALKRISHNAN et al, US Patent No. 6,028,612.

18. As per claim 3, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 2, however, does not expressly teach use of dynamic random access memory (DRAM). BALAKRISHNAN teaches the above feature (col 8, lines 3-23). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the DRAM processing means because "...the delay of the burst is fixed –(see col 8, lines 15-23)" and provides results in "minimizing the memory bandwidth consumed by the overall decoding process – see col 8, lines 21-23) of BALAKRISHNAN et al to modify the memory for video storing data taught by LINZER et al because both inventions share similar technological

Art Unit: 2676

environments and share similar problems, i.e., better utilization of bandwidth, and modification with the teaching of BALAKRISHNAN et al reduces bandwidth requirements.

18. As per claims 6 and 14, LINZER et al meet limitations of claims 1 and 9, LINZER et al teach wherein the colorspace components comprise a red color level, and a blue color level (see section 0042), however, does not expressly teach a green color level. BALAKRISHNAN et al teach the above feature (see col 10, lines 5-14 and col 11, lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the features for "minimizing the memory bandwidth consumed by the overall decoding process – see col 8, lines 21-23)" of BALAKRISHNAN et al to modify the memory for video storing data taught by LINZER et al because both inventions share similar technological environments and share similar problems, i.e., better utilization of bandwidth, and modification with the teaching of BALAKRISHNAN et al reduces bandwidth requirements.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McGuinness, US Patent No. 6,104,416 shares the same assignee as the supporting reference of BALAKRISHNAN et al. .

Art Unit: 2676

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY J. BLACKMAN whose telephone number is 571-272-7779. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEX SCHEDULE.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW BELLA can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANTHONY J BLACKMAN
Examiner
Art Unit 2676



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600